

Remarks

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action of July 13, 2005 in the Application. Claims 1-3, 7 and 10 had been amended. Claims 4-6, 8 and 9 had been cancelled. Claims 11-15 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 7 and 10-15 are presented for consideration.

The Examiner has rejected Applicant's claims 1, 4, 7 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Gerszberg, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,396,531). The Examiner has rejected Applicant's claims 2-3, 5-6 and 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerszberg, et al. in view of Johnson, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,584,039). With respect to Applicant's claims, as amended, the Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant's independent claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the present invention. Independent claim 1 is directed to a communication control apparatus for dividing one network into a first segment and a second segment, comprising a first port connected to said first segment; a second port connected to said second segment; a CIP header detecting unit adapted to detect whether or not an isochronous packet received by said first port includes a CIP (common isochronous packet) header conforms to IEC 61883 standard; and a control unit adapted to control to cause an the isochronous packet received by said first port not to be relayed to said second port, if it is detected that the isochronous packet received by said first port includes the CIP header.

Claim 1, as amended, specifically calls for a CIP header detector unit that is adapted to detect whether or not an isochronous packet that was received by the first port includes a CIP (common isochronous packet) header that conforms to the IEC 61883 standard. Referring to Figure 2 of the drawings of the present application, block 202 is a CIP header detecting part that

detects a CIP header that is defined in accordance with the IEC 61883 standard from an isochronous packet that is received by port P1 (page 8, line 20 to page 9, line 3 of the application). As disclosed in the application, the IEC 61883 standard refers to the “AV protocol” (page 8, lines 9-16 of the Application). Claim 1, as amended, further recites that a control unit controls the communication control apparatus to cause the isochronous packet that is received by the first port to not be relayed to the second port if it was detected that the isochronous packet includes the CIP header that conforms to the IEC 61883 standard. Referring to the flow chart shown in Figure 5 of the drawings, in step S505, the CIP header detecting part detects the CIP header from the isochronous packet that was received and if the CIP header conforms with the IEC 61883 standard, then the control part 205 causes the isochronous packet to not be relayed to the second part, as shown in steps S506, S507 and S508 (page 15, line 21 to page 16, line 16 of the Application; and Figure 10 of the drawings).

In the office action, the Examiner relies upon the Gerszberg, et al. patent and alleges that it discloses “a communication control apparatus (Fig. 9, item 513; column 22, line 39-47) for dividing one network into a first segment and a second segment, comprising: a first port connected to said first segment; a second port connected to second segment; and control means for providing such a control as to, when a predetermined condition is satisfied, cause an isochronous packet received by said first port not to be relayed to said second port (Fig. 47, column 38, line 50-55).” With regard to claim 4, the Examiner alleges that the Gerszberg, et al. patent discloses that “when the isochronous packet received by said first port is an isochronous [sic] that has been transmitted from a predetermined node in accordance with an AV Protocol, said control means provides such a control as to cause the isochronous packet received by said first port not to be relayed to said second port (Fig. 47; column 38, line 50-55).”

While the Gerszberg, et al. patent relates to a communication control apparatus and employs a living room set top box for providing parental control which can be programmed by a parent via a control menu (Fig. 47), the system disclosed in this patent ascertains whether or not the audio video signal is to be relayed depending upon the source (i.e., channel) from which the television program originated. As discussed in the Gerszberg, et al. patent, the user identifies the particular channels that can be viewed through the set top box, or can identify the particular channels that cannot be viewed through the set top box (see column 38, lines 50-55). In other words, the system disclosed in the Gerszberg, et al. patent detects the source (i.e., the channel number) of the AV signal and does not detect whether the received signal includes a CIP header that conforms to the IEC 61883 standard. Hence, the Gerszberg, et al. patent does not include a control unit that is adapted to cause a received isochronous packet to not be relayed if that packet includes such a CIP header. Rather, the system disclosed in the Gerszberg, et al. patent causes the received AV signal to not be relayed if the program represented by the AV signal is on an unauthorized channel.

It is further submitted that the Gerszberg, et al. patent's use of program ratings, such as shown in Figure 47 of that patent (and discussed in column 38, lines 55-59) likewise does not relate at all to whether or not the received signal includes an isochronous packet that has a CIP header that conforms to the IEC 61883 standard. Rather, data within the transmitted signal, which identifies the program rating, is utilized to assess whether or not the program should be relayed to the television.

Accordingly, Applicant's amended independent claim 1, and claims 7 and 10 dependent thereon, in reciting "a CIP header detecting unit adapted to detect whether or not an isochronous packet received by said first port includes a CIP (common isochronous packet) header conforms

to IEC 61883 standard” and “a control unit adapted to control to cause the isochronous packet received by said first port not to be relayed to said second port, if it is detected that the isochronous packet received by said first port includes the CIP header,” patently distinguish over the Gerszberg, et al. patent.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant’s independent claim 1, as well as claims 7 and 10 dependent thereon, are not anticipated by the Gerszberg, et al. patent. It is therefore requested that the rejection of claims 1, 7 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

With respect to the rejection of claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Gerszberg, et al. patent in view of the Johnson, et al. patent, it is submitted that the Johnson, et al. patent does not disclose those features of Applicant’s claimed invention, as discussed above. Thus, claims 2 and 3 are patentably distinct and unobvious over the Gerszberg et al. patent in view of the Johnson, et al. patent.

Moreover, it is submitted that the Johnson, et al. patent does not disclose the particular features recited in Applicant’s claim 2. In particular, claim 2, as amended, recites that “if it is detected that the isochronous packet received by said first port includes the CIP header, said control unit controls to replace the isochronous packet received by said first port with another isochronous packet and then to relay said another isochronous packet to said second port.” In the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that the Gerszberg, et al. patent does not disclose the features of claim 2, but the Examiner alleges that such features are disclosed in the Johnson, et al. patent. In particular, the Examiner refers to the Johnson, et al. patent at column 3, lines 5-7 and column 16, lines 47-55, for allegedly disclosing such features. Contrary to Examiner’s assertions, it is submitted that the particular sections relied upon by the Examiner refer to the use of multiple subchannels for writing to a plurality of output devices, where one of the subchannels

is utilized for a synchronization function (see column 15, line 15 to column 16, line 55). In particular, the Johnson, et al. patent states that “A subchannel for a non-existent device within the addressing range of a real control unit might be chosen for the synchronization function. Or, the channel subsystem might perform the definition of dummy subchannels to be used for synchronization channel programs. The use of dummy subchannels would simplify the processing of halt or clear functions and might be defined to support only the control no-operation, basic sense and sense identification input/output device commands.” (Column 16, lines 47-55). Such teaching in the Johnson, et al. patent does not at all relate to replacing an isochronous packet with another isochronous packet if it is detected that the isochronous packet received by the first port includes the CIP header. Although different information, or a dummy subchannel, may be provided in the Johnson, et al. patent, such occurs for a synchronization function that is completely unrelated to Applicant’s claimed detection of an isochronous packet that includes the CIP header that conforms to the IEC 61883 standard. Hence, the Johnson, et al. patent does not disclose the features recited in Applicant’s claim 2.

In view of the above, it is submitted that Applicant’s claims, as amended, patentably distinguish over the cited art of record. It is therefore requested that the rejection of claims 1-3, 7 and 10 be withdrawn.

New claims 11-15 are presented. Claims 11-15 are method claims that correspond to apparatus claims 1-3, 7 and 10. For those reasons previously discussed with respect to claims 1-3, 7 and 10, it is submitted that new claims 11-15 are patentably distinct and unobvious over the prior art of record. The allowance of claims 11-15 is solicited.

Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes an interview would expedite consideration of this Amendment or of the Application, a request is made that the Examiner telephone Applicant's counsel at 212-790-9200.

Dated: December 6, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mark Montague", written in a cursive style.

COWAN, LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN, P. C.
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
T (212) 790-9200

Mark Montague
Reg. No. 36,612